

The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association

Revue de l'Association Canadienne de Linguistique

Volume 2, Number 2

•

IIe année, Numéro 2

CONTENTS / SOMMAIRE

	Page
Editorial	39
W. S. AVIS, Speech Differences along the Ontario-United States Border. III: Pronunciation	41
G. TOUGAS, Quelques aspects peu étudiés du français canadien	60
G. L. BURSILL-HALL, Frequency of Consonant Clusters in French	66
<i>Linguisticae Canadiana 1955</i>	78
Secretary-Treasurer's Report	84

OCTOBER
1956



OCTOBRE
1956

CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE LINGUISTIQUE

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR / BUREAU ET COMITÉS POUR

1956 - 57

President Emeritus / *Président Honoraire*: Henry Alexander

President / *Président*: Gaston Dulong

Vice-President / *Vice-Président*: J. B. Rudnyckyj

Secretary-Treasurer / *Secrétaire-Trésorier*: W. S. Avis

Members of the Executive / *Membres du Conseil*: E. R. Seary, Rex Wilson, O. Starchuk

Editor of the Journal / *Rédacteur en chef de la Revue*: J.-P. Vinay

Associate Editors / *Rédacteurs adjoints*: M. H. Scargill, J. St. Clair-Sobell, H. Milnes, R. Valin

* * *

The Canadian Linguistic Association publishes a bi-annual *Journal*, the first issue of which appeared in October, 1954. Dues for Personal and Library Membership in the Society, which include subscription to the *Journal*, are \$2.00 a year, beginning June 1st. Cheques should be made payable to Dr. W. S. Avis, Secretary-Treasurer, and addressed to the Royal Military College, Kingston, Canada. Manuscripts in French and English should be sent to Prof. J.-P. Vinay, Section de Linguistique, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Montréal, Canada.

L'Association canadienne de linguistique publie deux fois par an une *Revue*, dont le premier numéro est daté d'octobre 1954. La cotisation, qui comprend l'abonnement à la *Revue*, est de \$2.00 par an, pour les membres de la Société comme pour les bibliothèques. Le renouvellement des cotisations se fait le 1er juin. Libeller les chèques au nom de Dr. W. S. Avis, Secrétaire-Trésorier, Royal Military College, Kingston, Canada. Les manuscrits (en français ou en anglais) doivent être adressés à J.-P. Vinay, Section de Linguistique, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Montréal, Canada.

Back numbers (when available) and single numbers of the *Journal*: \$1.00. The views expressed in articles signed by contributors are not necessarily those of the Editorial Board.

Numéros parus et numéros séparés (dans la mesure des disponibilités): \$1.00. La rédaction n'est responsable que des articles signés par elle.

Copyright 1956 by the Canadian Linguistic Association

Lithoprinted by

Braun-Brumfield, Inc.

Ann Arbor, Michigan

The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association

Revue de l'Association Canadienne de Linguistique

Volume 2, Number 2 OCTOBER/OCTOBRE 1956 IIe année, Numéro 2

Editor / *Rédacteur en chef:* J.-P. Vinay

Associate Editors / *Rédacteurs adjoints:* M. H. Scargill, J. St. Clair-Sobell, H. Milnes, R. Valin

Secretary-Treasurer / *Secrétaire-Trésorier:* W. S. Avis, RMC, Kingston.

CONTENTS / SOMMAIRE

	Page
Editorial	39
W. S. AVIS, Speech Differences along the Ontario-United States Border. III: Pronunciation.	41
G. TOUGAS, Quelques aspects peu étudiés du français canadien.	60
G. L. BURSILL-HALL, Frequency of Consonant Clusters in French	66
<i>Linguisticae Canadiana 1955</i>	78
Secretary-Treasurer's Report	84

EDITORIAL

¶ Lors de sa 3^e assemblée annuelle, tenue à l'Université de Montréal les 8 et 9 juin 1956, l'Association canadienne de linguistique a confié à une nouvelle équipe la rédaction de la *Revue*: J.-P. Vinay (Université de Montréal) en prend la direction, aidé de M. H. Scargill, J. St. Clair-Sobell, H. Milnes et R. Valin. La nouvelle rédaction tient à exprimer toute sa reconnaissance à M. H. Scargill, qui a assumé la lourde tâche de la mise en route de notre revue, ainsi qu'aux autorités de l'Université d'Alberta qui en ont assuré la publication. Profitant de ce déplacement d'ouest en est, la rédaction essaiera de faire une large place aux problèmes du franco-canadien et des Provinces maritimes. On voudrait également aborder l'étude des langues amérindiennes, qui ont figuré pour la première fois aux Cours d'été de la Faculté des Lettres de Montréal (juin-août 1956).

¶ The Linguistic Department of U of M. held a Linguistic Institute during the Summer 1956: W. S. Avis, from RMC, Kingston, our Secretary-Treasurer, was the visiting Professor for English. Courses were offered on English, French, Eskimo, Mohawk, and General Linguistics. This session was held in response to the motion presented at the Toronto meeting in June, 1955 "urging Canadian universities to give more time to linguistic studies" and train scholars who can make significant contributions to our science. Included on the staff of the institute were J.-P. Vinay (Director), H. Bertrand, R. Charbonneau, Gilles-R. Lefebvre, M. L'Abbé, Anita Robillard.

¶ Le VIII^e Congrès international des linguistes se tiendra à Oslo du 5 au 9 août 1957. Les linguistes canadiens ont été invités. Le président du congrès est le professeur Alf Sommerfelt; la secrétaire, Mlle Eva Sivertsen (Kirkeveien 98 A III, Oslo NV, Norvège).

¶ In order to reduce printing costs now that the *Journal* is "on its own", the Secretary and the Editors have decided to have it lithoprinted on the same lines as the Michigan publication

Language Learning. This number is therefore experimental and comments from members will be appreciated. The question of a *Style Sheet* was raised at the June meeting; it is now being compiled and will be included in our next issue.

¶La liste complète des membres paraîtra dans le prochain numéro: soyez certain que votre nom y figure correctement; renouvez promptement votre abonnement, comme vous le recommande le Secrétaire-trésorier (Voir page 84).

¶We are already thinking in terms of our next issue: articles on Canadian linguistics are requested by the Editors, as well as reviews of important works. A new feature is planned for the Journal under the title: *Varia*. Its aim will be to give short items of general interest to members. Pertinent details should be sent to the Editors in time to be included in the March issue.

SPEECH DIFFERENCES ALONG THE ONTARIO-
UNITED STATES BORDER

by

Walter S. Avis, R. M. C., Kingston

III. Pronunciation

The most satisfactory method of collecting data concerning speech habits demands that a trained fieldworker conduct personal interviews with representative informants. Since, however, the time and money required for carrying out such interviews are seldom available, the investigator must often turn to less satisfactory but more practicable methods; one of these is the multiple-choice questionnaire of the type used to gather the information for this limited survey of Ontario speech habits.¹ The fundamental weakness of the circulated questionnaire is self-evident: the informant must substitute for the trained field worker and observe his own usage. His success in making reliable observations will depend on his native intelligence and level of education, his understanding of the significance of the survey, and his conscientiousness with regard to answering the questions.

No less important to the success of the investigation is the questionnaire itself. Since the investigator normally has no contact with the informant, he must make certain that this instrument is properly fashioned. It should be interesting, concise, and unambiguous. If it is concise, interest is not hard to maintain, for most people find the task of answering the questions a pleasant one. But the problem of keeping the questions clear and unambiguous is more difficult. Here the investigator must call on his training and experience; he must have some knowledge of the probable variants current in the area and he must anticipate the dilemmas and uncertainties of his untrained informants.

Regardless of the aspect of language under investigation,² the difficulties inherent in the questionnaire method are many. Yet given a competent informant and a well-fashioned set of questions, much valuable information about usage can be collected, especially in the departments of vocabulary, grammar,

and syntax. With respect to pronunciation, however, the method has severe limitations which restrict the range of questions that can be asked with any expectation of reliable answers. Needless to say, the accurate recording of pronunciation differences requires a degree of linguistic awareness not to be expected of the untrained observer. Consequently, the investigator must phrase his questions without recourse to phonetic symbols, using instead unscientific "folk terminology" and inadequate re-spellings; for certain purposes he may use single letters of the alphabet, provided that these are not ambiguous.

Another approach is to set up alternative rhyming words as a means of determining the informant's pronunciation of a particular item: "Does *vase* rhyme with "face", "paws", "days", or "razz"? For distinguishing many significant dialectal differences, however, there is no substitute for the ear of a trained phonetician. In the foregoing illustration, for example, the informant's underlining of the second alternative indicates only that for him *vase* rhymes with *paws*, which word he may pronounce with any one of a range of low-back vowels, [ɑ,ɒ,ɔ].³ Moreover, speakers who say [vaz], and there are quite a number who do so, would probably underline *paws* as being the nearest alternative offered. In short, distinctions between vowels in the range low central [ɑ] to low back [ɔ] are not reflected by this method.

Another illustration of the limitations of the questionnaire method with regard to pronunciation might be illuminating. One of the striking differences between Ontario speech and that south of the line is the actualization of the diphthong in such words as *house*, *crouch*, and *out*. In these words, and others where the diphthong precedes a voiceless consonant, the typical Ontario pronunciation approximates [həUs], [krəUtʃ], [əUtʃ], that is, a "fast" diphthong with a relatively high beginning. Across the border the usual pronunciation is [haUs] etc., with a "slower" diphthong which begins in a more or less retracted low-central position. On the other hand, in words where the diphthong precedes a voiced consonant, or is final, the "slower" diphthong is usual in both areas: *down* [daUn], *cov* [kaU], etc. Moreover, with respect to this class of words a whole range of diphthongs, including [aU, aU, æU, əU] may be heard, varying from region to region and from social class to social class, and occurring in several combinations according to phonetic environment. Such sub-phonemic complexities are quite obviously beyond the capacities of untrained inform-

ants to distinguish and record; furthermore, the investigator lacks adequate resources for framing questions which would elicit the appropriate responses.

In this survey, therefore, questions relative to pronunciation were aimed at broad distinctions which the informants could be expected to recognize. In framing the questions, the rhyme-word technique was used because it seemed the least likely to lead to confusion. Yet in spite of the measures adopted to avoid it, confusion was clearly evident in the responses of the few informants representing the uneducated class. Because most of these persons failed to answer the questions unambiguously and because several of the items were such as might be unfamiliar to some of them, their questionnaires were set aside. Thus all responses considered in the final analysis are from informants of Senior Matriculation standing or higher, most of them university seniors or graduates.

In general, the results of this survey support the conclusion reached in my earlier articles on vocabulary and grammar: divided usage prevails throughout the province with respect to most items which are differently pronounced by educated speakers in England and America. As a matter of fact, none of the informants follow British or American usage consistently over the whole range of items here under investigation. Where Ontario pronunciation differs from that south of the border, the difference is usually accounted for by the widespread currency of forms characteristic of British speech. Pronunciations which are typically Canadian as opposed to British or American are rare, though a few that are uncommon elsewhere have apparently become general throughout Ontario.⁴

The word *vase* is most commonly pronounced /vez/ in Ontario, whereas the usual pronunciation south of the border is /ves/: of 109 informants, 54 offered the former and 12 the latter. The British form, /vaz/, which is occasionally heard in the States, was offered by 41 informants, while 2 offered /væz/ as their pronunciation. The form /vaz/, which in Ontario is often /vaz/, undoubtedly enjoys prestige in some Canadian and American circles, a situation recognized by the informant who claimed to use /vez/ for the garden variety and /vaz/ for the Ming variety.⁵

Of considerable interest is another pronunciation which is characteristic of Ontario speech (and of Canadian speech generally), namely, ['karki] for *khaki*, a form used by 90 of 109 informants. British ['ko:kI] was offered by 15 and the Ameri-

can ['kaeki] by 4 only. This generalization of the form ['karki] provides a striking illustration of a fairly common phonetic phenomenon: the intrusive *r* analogy. In areas where some speakers pronounce preconsonantal *r* and some do not, some of the *r*-pronouncing speakers adopt an [r] in words not having that consonant historically.⁶ Thus in parts of South Carolina and New England the term *poached eggs* is sometimes pronounced ['portʃt] eggs by speakers who normally pronounce preconsonantal *r*.⁷ Some of these speakers, perhaps unfamiliar with the word *poach*, hear their *r*-less neighbours pronouncing *porch* and *poach* in the same way, let's say as [potʃ], Since *porch* is [portʃ] in their speech, they adopt *poach* as homonymous with it; other *r*-speakers who hear the word for the first time in this unhistorical form adopt it and the variant gains currency. In a similar way the southern term *crocus sack* ['krokəs 'sæk] 'burlap bag', was simplified to ['krokə - 'sæk], thence by the intrusive *r* analogy to ['krokər 'sæk] in *r*-pronouncing areas, and eventually (by substitution of a synonym for the second term) to ['krokər bag], a variant quite often heard in the South Carolina Piedmont.⁸ The form (warʃ) for *wash*, a pronunciation heard widely throughout the northern United States and Canada is doubtless the result of a process similar to that which accounts for the intrusive *r* in the words discussed above.⁹

The word *khaki*, which is derived from Urdu *khākī* "dusty", appears to have been borrowed into English during the nineteenth century, the avenue being the British Army in India. In British Southern Received Standard, an *r*-less dialect, the word is pronounced ['kɑ:kɪ], but seems to have become ['karkɪ], by analogy with some such word as *darky* among some *r*-pronouncing British speakers. This form with the intrusive *r* might have migrated into Canada through these speakers; or it might have come in as ['kɑ:kɪ] and converted by *r*-pronouncing Canadians to ['karkɪ] through an analogical process similar to that already suggested. Indeed, both of these possibilities might have operated, one reinforcing the other. In any event, ['karkɪ] is the pronunciation current at all social levels in Canada, a linguistic fact which has not yet been recognized by the dictionaries, though few of these claim to record Canadian usage. It is to be hoped that the lexicographers now at work compiling dictionaries of Canadian usage will take cognizance of this Canadianism.¹⁰

Although probably not a Canadianism, the pronunciation /'zɛbrə/ for *zebra* is widely used in Ontario. Strangely enough,

few dictionaries record this alternative to /'zibra/, the only form recorded in each of those I consulted with the exception of the SOD. Of 151 informants questioned concerning their pronunciation of *zebra*, 79 offered /'zəbrə/ and 72 /'zibra/. If divided usage is as evenly balanced between these two forms throughout Canada as it is in this sample of Ontario speech, there would be no reason for not recording both pronunciations as acceptable Canadian usage. If, as the American dictionaries suggest, /'zibra/ is the form universally used in the United States, the widespread currency of /'zəbrə/ in Ontario suggests yet another difference between the speech habits of many Ontarioans and those of their neighbours to the south.

Observant Americans south of the border have singled out several touchstones which in combination point to a speaker's Ontario origin. One of these is the characteristic pronunciation of *house* and *out* referred to above. Another is the form /bin/ *been*, which contrasts with American /bIn/, particularly in stressed position. A third is /ə'gen/ *again*, which the American usually pronounces /ə'gən/. In the last two instances Canadian usage reflects British practice, though many Ontarians use the same forms as their American neighbours.

Another British pattern which is reflected in Ontario speech is to be heard in the pronunciation of the nouns *process* and *progress*, which have /o/ in the first syllable in British usage as opposed to /a/ in American. The 103 informants answering the questionnaire showed a marked preference for the former. On the other hand, the noun *produce* has /a/ in the first syllable in British usage and /o/ in American. Here again, most Ontario speakers appear to reflect British practice.¹¹ It might be added that the noun *proceeds*, which usually has /o/ in the first syllable in both Britain and America, is so pronounced by all of the Ontario informants. The following table shows the number of informants using each pronunciation:

	<i>process</i>	<i>progress</i>	<i>produce</i>	<i>proceeds</i>
/o/	90	68	32	103
/a/	13	35	71	0

These figures suggest that the American /a/ is more frequent in *progress* than in *process* but no reason can be offered for this difference. It would be interesting to know whether or not the American forms are in process of displacing the British. Such would seem to be the case with regard to a number of items discussed below.

Another series of words which indicates the extent of divided usage among Ontario speakers is the large group ending in -ile: *docile*, *fertile*, *futile*, *senile*, *virile* (to which might be added *missile*, *projectile*, and others). In the last syllable of all of these words British usage favours the diphthong /aɪ/, American the monophthong /ɪ/ or /ə/, or, in certain environments, a syllabic [ɪ]. Ontario usage as reflected in this survey shows the majority preference for /aɪ/, except in the case of *fertile*. It must be pointed out, however, that the questionnaires reveal considerable variation from speaker to speaker, a complexity that is obscured in the following table, which shows only the general pattern:

	senile	virile	docile	futile	fertile
/aɪ/	139	128	93	97	61
/ɪ/, /ə/, [ɪ]	9	20	7	51	87

The pronunciation of the first syllable of *senile*, *virile*, and *docile* was not enquired into; yet there seems good reason to expect considerable variety here too: /'sɪn-/; /'sɛn-/; /'vɪr-/; /'vaɪr-/; /'dɒs-/; /'dɑ:s-/ . With two variants current for both syllables, four pronunciations for each word are possible and doubtless all four are in use. The pronunciation /sɛnɔ:l/ for *senile* merits comment, for it is in widespread use among educated Canadians at least, in spite of the fact that no dictionary I have consulted, British or American, records it. The word *profile*, though it appears to belong to the series discussed above, does not conform to the pattern. In British English, according to Daniel Jones,¹² the accepted pronunciation is ['prɔ:fɪ:l] whereas the *Shorter Oxford* offers ['prɔ:fəl, -il, -ɪl]. The American dictionaries, on the other hand, offer only /'profəl/, which is the pronunciation used by the Ontario informants 146 to 2, these two preferring /'profɪ:l/. There was no indication from this survey that the British /'profil/ has any currency at all in Ontario.

A group of words ending in -ine affords further evidence of divided usage in pronunciation among Ontario speakers. As with the previous group, the vowel of the final syllable was the focus of attention, the sample words being *bovine*, *quinine*, *genuine*, and *sanguine*. In *bovine* Ontario speakers seem to favour /aɪ/ in the final syllable, a pronunciation usual in both Britain and America. On the other hand, /'bovɪn/, which is also current in American usage, is fairly common. *Genuine*

is most commonly /'dʒɛnjuɪn/ as prescribed by dictionaries both British and American, but /'dʒenjuəɪn/ is widely heard in spite its being proscribed for more than a century. *Sanguine* most commonly has /ɪ/ in the last syllable, /'saŋgwain/ being little used; the predominance of the preferred pronunciation in this case is doubtless due to literary nature of the word. The results of the survey for these words are as follows:

	<i>quinine</i>	<i>bovine</i>	<i>genuine</i>	<i>sanguine</i>
/aɪ/	104	70	55	40
/ɪ/	50	34	109	124

Although the majority of the informants use /aɪ/ in the last syllable of *quinine*, the currency of variant pronunciations for both syllables complicates the picture. Furthermore, although no investigation was made of the fact, stress may occur on either the first or the second syllable in the case of some combinations. Thus, while 104 of 154 informants used /aɪ/ in the last syllable of *quinine*, 66 pronounced the word /'kwɪnain/ (stress undetermined) and 38 /'kwaɪnain/, the latter form being American, the former British, though apparently not the most commonly heard in Britain. The preferred British form /'kwɪnɪn/ is used by 50 of the informants.

The prefixes *anti-*, *semi-*, *multi-* (*anti-social* etc.) are pronounced /'æntɪ/, /'sɛmɪ/, /'mʌltɪ/ by most Ontario speakers, a practice which parallels British usage. The frequently heard American /'æntaɪ/, /'sɛmaɪ/, /'mʌltaɪ/ have little currency, though usage varies slightly from word to word, as the following table shows:¹³

	<i>anti-</i>	<i>semi-</i>	<i>multi-</i>
/ɪ/	85	88	93
/aɪ/	16	13	8

This difference between Ontario usage and that of many Americans has been observed by Canadian teen-agers who refer to their neighbours across the border as "*semis*" /'sɛmaɪz/. It does not appear to have been observed by most American dictionary-makers, however, for it usually goes unrecorded, except as a variant pronunciation for the substantive *anti*. *Webster's New World Dictionary* is one of the few that do record this Americanism; it is also one of the few that record an-

other pronunciation which has wide currency south of the border but little or none in Ontario, namely, /-is/ for *-ese* in such words as *Chinese*, *Javanese*, etc. The pronunciation /-iz/ is usual in Ontario, as in Britain; in fact it is probably usual in the United States. Certainly the *New World* offers it as its first entry, labelling /-is/, the second, as an "older" form.

A pronunciation pattern which is heavily frowned upon in some Ontario circles may be heard in the series, *tune*, *duke*, *new*, and other words where the monophthong [u] competes with a diphthong, [ju], [Iu], or [iu], that is, when the vowel is preceded by an alveolar consonant. In such words British usage is characterized by a diphthong, northern American by a monophthong; in Ontario, usage is very much divided and unsettled. Yet there is little doubt but that the British practice enjoys prestige, the diphthong being widely used by educated speakers, at least after /t/, /d/, and /n/; after /s/ and /l/, as in *suit*, *lute*, *superstitious*, *absolute*, the British diphthong is unusual. This survey shows that there is a remarkable degree of individual variation of the words listed in the following table:

	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>news</i>	<i>dew</i>	<i>duke</i>	<i>tune</i>	<i>due</i>	<i>student</i>	<i>lute</i>	<i>suit</i>
[ju]/[iu]	97	93	64	58	56	52	73	19	18
[u]	56	51	41	47	49	53	75	86	87

Relatively few speakers reported that they use one pronunciation or the other consistently in all of the above words. This lack of consistency suggests that many of the informants have adopted the prestige pronunciation without extending it uniformly throughout the entire series. Thus many speakers say ['tiuzdi] but ['student], [niuz] but [tun], and quite a number have a contrast between *dew* [diu] and *due* [du].

The remarkably unsettled conditions with respect to the pronunciation of these words in Ontario reflects social rather than regional variation, though the latter may contribute in some measure to the diversity. It seems to be the rule that the incidence of the monophthongal [duk]/[nuz] pattern increases sharply as the cultural level of the informants becomes lower. An interesting by-product of the process of adopting the prestige forms is apparent in the sporadic pronunciations of *moon*, *noon*, *too* as [miun], [niun], [tiu]. The occurrence of this hyper-urbanism in association with words which

historically have [u] is an almost certain indication that the speaker has switched from [u] to [iu] in all or some of the words in which both forms compete, having at the same time extended by analogy his adopted diphthongal pronunciation to words which are not ordinarily in the same pattern.

In the Northern speech area of the United States, to which the region adjacent to Ontario belongs, the monophthongal pronunciation of *duke*, *news*, *tune* is not only usual but is recognized as a form widely used by cultured speakers, at least by the more up-to-date dictionaries. Yet there is no doubt that the diphthongal types are also in use both as regional and social variants. Indeed, these forms enjoy a certain prestige in some quarters, a situation reflected in the speech of several university professors and radio announcers I have heard using the hyper-forms [niun] and [tiu]. Conditions along the border, it seems, differ only in the degree of divided and unsettled usage with respect to these words. In Ontario, social pressure is noticeably in favour of [iu], pronunciations such as [duk], [nuz] being considered inelegant by many people (including, it seems, those who furnish dictionaries for use in Ontario schools); south of the line, however, both pronunciations are recognized as standard speech acceptable at all levels of society.

The word *drought*, so spelled, is pronounced /draʊt/ by most people in Ontario, whereas across the border the form /draʊθ/, often spelled *drouth*, is widely used, the latter form being a legitimate development from an earlier English dialectal variant. Of 104 informants questioned with respect to the pronunciation of *drought*, 98 offered /draʊt/, 1 /draʊθ/, 1 /drəθ/, 1 /druθ/, and 3 /droθ/. The first is the standard British form; the others occur in various dialects both in England and America. *Trough*, another "ough" word which was included in the questionnaire, is pronounced /trɔθ/ by 96 informants, /trəθ/ by 8, the exact nature of the low-back vowel being undetermined. The final /f/ is characteristic of educated speech in both England and America, though final /θ/ does occur in some American dialect areas, particularly in New England, a possible source of the minority form in Ontario. For *slough*, a third word in this class, the most usual Ontario pronunciation is /slaʊ/, as in British usage; this form is used by 68 of 87 informants, while 19 use /slu/, a form having wide currency in the United States. On the Canadian prairie, *slough* "any fairly large body of residual water" is an everyday word pronounced /slu/; in Ontario the word is not in

common use; some of my informants were quite unfamiliar with it, while others knew it only as a book word pronounced /slaU/, as in Bunyan's "Slough of Despond." Consequently, it is usually possible to tell a westerner from an easterner by his pronunciation of this word.

Diversity is evident on both sides of the border with respect to the pronunciation of several words which belong to a group of monosyllables having the vowel /o:/ in Middle English. Some words of this group have /u/ generally in Modern English, *food*, *tooth*; some /U/, *book*, *foot*; and a very few /ə/, *blood*. In still others usage varies regionally between /u/ and /U/, and in some cases /ə/, *room*, *root*, *roof*, *hoof*, *soot*, *coop*, *hoop*. A number of words in this class were investigated in this survey:

	<i>tooth</i>	<i>food</i>	<i>roof</i>	<i>root</i>	<i>hoof</i>	<i>soot</i>	<i>foot</i>	<i>book</i>
/u/	100	145	143	92	104	11	1	0
/U/	2	3	5	10	44	79	101	102
/ə/	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0

These results suggest that /u/ is more common in *root*, *roof*, and *hoof* throughout Ontario than is the case across the border.¹⁴ In this respect Ontario practice seems to parallel British usage. *Soot*, which is commonly /sUt/ in both British and American English, is so pronounced by most Ontarians. The forms /sut/ and /sət/, which are also heard occasionally in Ontario are both to be heard as regional variants in both Britain and America. It might be added that a number of the informants offering /sut/ were of Scots parentage, a fact which suggests Northern English as one of the contributors to diversity of speech in Ontario.

With respect to a number of words listed on the questionnaire, British pronunciation forms have become generalized almost to the exclusion of forms current south of the border. The past-tense form *shone*, for example, is pronounced /ʃən/ by 101 of 104 informants, the other 3 claiming to use /ʃon/, the usual American form; similarly, 101 of 104 pronounced *program(me)* /'prəgræm/ rather than /'prəgrəm/, a form widely current in the United States. The British pronunciation for the letter Z, namely, /zəd/, is used by 143 of 153 informants, American /zi/ by 10; British /'ræʃən/ *ration* is used by 99 of 104, American /'reʃən/ by 5. Moreover, the word *buoy*, often pronounced /'bui/ in the U.S., is most com-

monly /boɪ/ in Ontario (as in Britain), 97 to 7. Several of the informants offering /bui/ pointed to maritime influence, quite justly inasmuch as this form is fairly common on the east coast.

Not all pronunciation differences along the border are as readily noticed as those discussed in the last paragraph. It takes a practiced ear to detect such subtle differences as those between /sə'dʒɛst/ and /səg'dʒɛst/ for *suggest* and /'flɪgər/ and /'flɪgjər/ for *figure*, the first member of each pair reflecting British usage and the second American. I first became aware of these two variants of *suggest* (and *suggestion*) while living in Michigan several years ago. Since I had observed only /sə'dʒɛst/, my own form, in Ontario, I concluded that /səg'dʒɛst/ must be an Americanism; here, I thought, is a striking difference between Canadian and American usage. However, this conclusion proved far from accurate in the light of the responses to this questionnaire. Although /sə'dʒɛst/ does appear to be the more common pronunciation in Ontario, /səg'dʒɛst/ is much more widely used than I had supposed: 61 of 104 informants use the former, 43 the latter. Such inaccurate conclusions based on personal observation underscore the importance of extensive and objective surveys of actual speech in the preparation of statements concerning usage.

As to the pronunciation of *figure*, I had known that schoolmarm's in Canada have long inveighed against /'flɪgər/ as "slovenly" diction, while advocating the more "proper" /'flɪgjər/, or even /'flɪgjUr/, forms which happen to be characteristically American. Although I personally use /'figər/, the form characteristic of British usage, this survey reveals that I belong to the minority group, for only 33 of 104 do so. In this case it seems clear that the prestige of British usage is fighting a losing battle, probably because connotations of slovenliness have become associated with the British form.

Some words which have alternate pronunciations in English generally, for example, *leisure* and (*n*)*either*, appear to have more or less neutral connotations; consequently, persons who might take exception to certain variants of *genuine* or *figure* would find no quarrel with either /'lɛzər/ or /'lizər/ or with /'niðər/ or /'naɪðər/. Yet in each of these words the British seem to prefer one form, the Americans the other. It is typical of Ontario usage that both British and American forms are widely used, although in one case the British predominates and in the other the American. Thus the British pronunciation of *leisure*, with /ɛ/ in the first syllable as opposed to Amer-

ican /i/, is preferred 92 to 59, whereas the American pronunciation of (*n*) either, with /i/ in the first syllable as opposed to British /aI/, is preferred 98 to 53.

In many instances, however, American pronunciation practice is paralleled in Ontario speech to the virtual exclusion of British. It is common knowledge, for example, that Ontarians (and most Canadians) actualize preconsonantal and final *r* in such words as *cart* and *car*; in this practice their usage parallels that immediately south of the border rather than British Received Standard, which is *r*-less. The words *clerk* and *derby*, pronounced /klərk/ and /'dərbi/ on both sides of the border, further illustrate this shared feature and at the same time illustrate another well-known pattern of pronunciation wherein both Canadian and American usage differs from British, for [klɔ:k] and ['də:bɪ] are the Received Standard forms for these words.

Ontario usage also parallels that of their American neighbours in the almost complete generalization of [æ], the so-called "flat a", in such words as *class*, *dance*, *bath*.¹⁵ This similarity, along with the presence of a similar /r/ phoneme, contributes much of the "American" colouring attributed to Canadian English by Britishers. In words of this class, and there are quite a number of them, the British [ɑ], the so-called "broad a", is relatively rare, although it does occur occasionally, often as [a], usually in the speech of those who consciously adopt British usage because of its prestige value in certain circles. *Aunt* and *drama*, probably because of the social environment in which they are used, appear to have a higher incidence of the "broad a" than most others in the group; for some reason, probably associated with social connotations, *rather* is pronounced ['raðər], less often ['raðər], by quite a large number of people. The following table shows the results of the survey with regard to a sample of words in this group:

	<i>class</i>	<i>dance</i>	<i>bath</i>	<i>laugh</i>	<i>aunt</i>	<i>drama</i>	<i>rather</i>	<i>palm</i>	<i>calm</i>
/æ/	144	142	138	134	132	83	98	4	4
[a]/[ɑ]	2	4	8	12	14	17	48	96	96

Calm and *palm* were included in this table because they are pronounced /kaem/, /paem/ by many uneducated speakers in Ontario, just as they are south of the border. The survey shows, however, that the "broad a", here again usually [a], is the more acceptable vowel socially, just as it is in both

Britain and America. It should be pointed out that the questionnaire offered no choice between [ɑ] and [a] for the simple reason that there was no satisfactory way of doing so without resorting to phonetic symbols. Furthermore, the question of the presence or absence of /l/ in these words was not raised.

Another well-known Americanism which is also typical of Ontario English may be heard in the actualization of /hw/ initially in such words as *whether*, *whine*, *whales*, which in Southern Received Standard are homophonous with *weather*, *wine*, *Wales*. In the Northern United States initial /hw/ is very much predominant, though by no means universal, as the exclusion of forms with initial /w/ from most American dictionaries suggests.¹⁶ In Ontario there appears to be a great deal of divided and unsettled usage with respect to this feature: some speakers use /hw/ consistently in the words under discussion; others use /w/ consistently; still others use either, depending on the word, the conditions of stress, or the sheer chance of selection. In answering the questionnaire the informants were confronted with a series of word pairs: *which:witch*, *whether:weather*, *where:wear*, *whales:Wales*, *white:wight*, *whine:wine*, and asked to underline each pair pronounced alike. The majority, or 68 of the 159 informants, claimed to make a distinction in each case; 50 claimed to make no distinction; and 41 claimed that their practice was inconsistent. The reliability of these responses is open to question, for the phonetic distinction involved is not an easy one for the linguistically untrained person to detect. Yet my observations of the practice of some of the informants, and of other speakers, suggest that these results do reflect the general situation in Ontario: much divided and unsettled usage, but a predominance of the /hw/ variants.

In pronouncing the word *greasy*, Ontario speakers almost unanimously say /'grisi/, as do their American neighbours in the Northern speech area. This pronunciation is used by 103 of the 104 informants, whereas only 1 uses the British (and non-northern American) /'grizi/. The pronunciation of *tomato* in Ontario also parallels American practice in favouring /tə'meto/, 108 of 152 informants preferring this form. Another pronunciation which has wide currency in the United States, namely, /tə'mæto/ is used by 32, while the typically British /tə'moto/ is used by only 12, some of whom undoubtedly use [a] rather than [u].

An interesting example of what appears to be a recent encroachment of a British pronunciation in Ontario is reflected

in the increasing popularity of /'ʃɛdʒUl/ for *schedule*, a word which in the United States is pronounced /'skedʒUl/. The latter form is still the most commonly heard in Ontario, as indicated by the 104 to 52 preference registered by my informants. It is my opinion that the use of the British form by CBC announcers has influenced the pronunciation of many Canadians with respect to this word. That the swing is recent is suggested by the fact that a number of informants admit to having adopted /'ʃedʒUl/ during the past few years. In this category, no doubt, is the CBC announcer who, in broadcasting the late news, spoke of a train wreck being the result of the engineer falling behind /'skedʒUl/ and who five minutes later informed his hearers that the CBC broadcasting /'ʃedʒUl/ was ended for the day.¹⁸

The speech of Ontarioans reflects another striking pronunciation feature which is often described as an Americanism, namely, the "voicing" of intervocalic /t/ by partial assimilation to the preceding and following vowels. This process, which may well represent one of the major linguistic changes taking place in North American English, results in a number of words such as *bleating:bleeding, butter:budder* becoming homophonous or nearly so¹⁹. Since this process is far from being complete and since it affects a very wide range of words indeed, there is a great deal of diversity from speaker to speaker and from word to word. The situation, moreover, is made more complex by the currency of several consonants intermediate between fortis, voiceless /t/ and lenis, voiced /d/. The problem is one demanding the serious attention of linguists, for what appears to be a widespread phenomenon throughout this continent is now being dealt with by some people as if it were no more than the slovenliness of improperly educated individuals. A thorough investigation of this problem might provide evidence to convince these Canutes of the true nature of the tide they are trying to stem.

The phonological distinctions which must be made in analysing usage with respect to the voicing of intervocalic /t/ are, needless to say, quite beyond the untrained observer. For one thing he has not the means of recording the distinctions he may hear; for another he is likely to be too much under the influence of the spelled form to dissociate what he writes from what he says. Finally, he might very well be aware that to pronounce *butter* as *budder* is considered "bad form". Under such influences his response might fall short of being objective. I have certainly met people who often use such pronunciations

as /'adəwa/ for *Ottawa* and /'dəmən, strədəd/ for *demonstrated*, but who spiritedly deny that they do so. As any investigator knows full well, direct questioning may bring unreliable responses whenever the item concerned is one having connotations of social inferiority.

The abovementioned pronunciation feature was included in the questionnaire in spite of the danger of getting unreliable responses. The informants were again given a series of word pairs: *bleating: bleeding, bitter: bidder, latter: ladder, kitty: kiddie, Ottawa: "oddawa"* and asked to underline the pairs pronounced alike. Of the 102 informants answering this question, 52 claimed that they pronounce the words in each pair differently, presumably having /t/ in the first member and /d/ in the second. On the other hand, 50 thought they pronounced at least some of the pairs alike. The results suggest that the voicing of intervocalic /t/ is not an uncommon practice among Ontario speakers of the educational level represented by this group. Since the limitations on the reliability of these results point toward the likelihood of denial, it is quite possible that the feature is more widespread than the figures indicate, though the practice would undoubtedly vary from word to word and from speaker to speaker.

This survey, for all its limitations, reveals that there is much diversity with respect to the pronunciation of many words among Ontario speakers. Where clear-cut predominance is shown for any one pronunciation, the preferred form is apt to parallel British usage when the word is literary and consequently of limited currency in speech, and American usage when the word is in widespread general use. The implications seem to be that British forms are apt to have greater currency at the top of the social pyramid, American forms greater currency at the popular level. But the most significant conclusion to be drawn from this survey is that Ontario English (and surely Canadian English generally) is neither American nor British, but a complex different in many respects from both in vocabulary, grammar and syntax, and pronunciation. The high degree of diversity apparent in Ontario speech suggests that any hopes of achieving a cut-and-dried speech standard are forlorn.

It must be recognized that acceptable variant pronunciations are numerous in the speech of educated Canadians, variants which reflect influence both British and American: such recognition is the only realistic approach to the problem of diversity as it exists in Canada. This view does not imply

that "anything goes" by any means; it does imply, however, that vain attempts to stamp out variants, either British or American, which are in general use among educated Canadians should cease. Furthermore, it must be recognized that certain pronunciations which are in widespread educated use in Canada, though perhaps not elsewhere, should be received as acceptable usage. Canadian scholars now at work on dictionaries of Canadian usage have the obligation of determining what usage actually is among educated Canadians, who set the fashions of language. Meeting this obligation will require a far more extensive investigation of Canadian speech habits than has yet been made, especially in the field of pronunciation. The dictionaries at present in use in Canadian institutes of learning are, for the most part, either American or British and do not reflect Canadian usage as such. The few so-called "Canadian" dictionaries in use in our schools are little more than derivatives of American and British works, derivatives which are perpetuating misinformation of great variety. How can they do otherwise when they lack the authority of extensive speech surveys, when the few concessions made to Canadian usage found there are little more than the personal observations (often erroneous) of the editors. Such dictionaries are too often a source of confusion to all who consult them.

NOTES

¹Part I (Vocabulary) and Part II (Grammar and Syntax) of this series appeared in the *JCLA*, 1 (Oct., 1954), 13-8 and (Mar., 1955). 14-9. The information comes from three sources, which accounts for the disparity in the total number of responses from item to item: two questionnaires (one circulated at Queen's University in 1949-1950, the other at R.M.C. in 1954-5), and, where relevant, the records of the *Linguistic Atlas* for eastern and western Ontario.

²For a detailed discussion of these difficulties see Frederic G. Cassidy, "A Method for Collecting Dialect," *Pub. Am. Dialect Soc.*, 20 (Nov., 1953), 5-96, which includes a fully developed questionnaire.

³The symbols used here are substantially those of the International Phonetic Association. Since only broad distinctions are here dealt with, phonemic notation is generally used; where subphonemic variations are discussed or where the phonemic status of the item under discussion is obscure, broad phonetic notation is substituted. The following partial key, based on my Ontario speech, might be helpful: (vowels) /i/ as in *beat*, /ɪ/ *bit*, /e/ *bait*, /ɛ/ *bet*, /æ/ *bat*, /ɑ/ *balm* (/bam/, midway between the /æ/ of *lather* and the /a/ of *father*),

/ə/ *bot* (also *bought* in my speech), /ɔ/ *bog*, /ɔ/ *law* (the last three vowels are probably not phonemically distinctive in my dialect), /o/ *boat*, /U/ *book*, /u/ *boot*, /iu/ *beaut*, /ə/butt, *Bert*, *sofa*, *duffer* (/bət/, /bərt/, /'sofə/, /'dəfər/), /aI/ *bide*, /aU/ *brow*, /ɔI/ *Boyd*. The consonant sounds not represented by symbols having the conventional alphabet values are symbolized as follows (all examples having the relevant sound in final position): /θ/ *bath*, /ð/ *bathe*, /ʒ/ *dish*, /ʒ/ *mirage*, /tʃ/ *ditch*, /dʒ/ *ridge*, /ŋ/ *rang*, /'/ main stress symbol placed before stressed syllable as in *above* /ə'bəv/, ./ secondary stress symbol placed before stressed syllable as in /'sskrə, təri/. The symbol /j/, representing a phoneme which does not occur in final position in English, may be illustrated by *you* /ju/ *beyond* /bΓjand/.

⁴In referring to a pronunciation as "usual" in Ontario, Britain, or America, I do not deny its currency elsewhere, I simply mean that to the best of my knowledge the form is the most commonly used by educated people in Ontario, in Britain (SRS) and in America (Northern speech area).

⁵The form /vez/ is occasionally heard on the American side of the border; it is, according to the *Linguistic Atlas* records, unusually common in metropolitan New York.

⁶See Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "Postvocalic *r* in South Carolina: A Social Analysis," *American Speech*, XXIII (1948), 195-203.

⁷See Herbert Penzl, "New England Terms for Poached Eggs," *American Speech*, IX (1934), 90-5.

⁸See Walter S. Avis, "Crocus Bag: A Problem in Areal Linguistics," *American Speech*, XXX (Feb., 1955), 5-16.

⁹The final /r/ often heard from British and other *r*-less speakers in Indian /'Indiər/, *idea* /aɪ'diər/, *alpha* /'ælfər/, *beta* /'betər/, etc. is the result of a somewhat different process. Such speakers pronounce the isolated words *father*, *mother* as /'fɑðə/, final historical *r* having been "lost" in their dialect. Thus the final vowel of these forms, /ə/, is identical with that in /aɪ'diə/ and /'Indiə/. When these speakers say *father* and *mother*, that is, where the word *father* precedes a word beginning with a vowel, the "lost" final *r* is restored to function as a hiatus-breaker, /'fɑðər ən 'məðə/. This so-called "linking *r*", which in the speech of many people occurs regularly under these circumstances, is transferred by some speakers to such expressions as the *idea of it* /ði aɪ'diər əv It/ and *India Office* /'Indiər,ɒfɪs/, where /r/ has no historical justification. This type of intrusive *r* also finds its way into the speech of persons who speak dialects having final /r/, for when *idea* or *India*, being often heard in the linking sequence, are spoken by these people, they are on occasion pronounced with a final *r*, just as in *father* /'fɑðər/ and *mother* /'məðər/.

¹⁰This Canadian pronunciation is frequently reflected in student spellings and occasionally appears in print: "... [he] wore glasses, kharki-colored trousers and jackets...." *The North Shore Leader*, Newcastle, N.B., April 8, 1955, p. 2, col. 4. I am indebted to Mr. C. J. Lovell for this citation.

¹¹Since the pronunciation of the second syllable of *produce* was not enquired into, I can offer no information as to how prevalent the American pronunciation /'produs/ is in Ontario. My personal observations indicate that this pronunciation, like /'ævənu/ for *avenue*, is not very often heard from Ontario speakers.

¹²*An English Pronouncing Dictionary* (London, 1919), p. 303.

¹³I have heard at least one American who regularly uses /aI/ in these prefixes say /kən,staenT'nopəl/ for *Constantinople*, an interesting hyper-urbanism indeed.

¹⁴See Stuart Robertson (revised by Frederic G. Cassidy), *The Development of Modern English* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954), pp. 396-7 and fn. 45. Chapter 12 contains a large number of up-to-date general statements concerning American regional usage based to a large extent on *Linguistic Atlas* records. It is a matter of interest that dictionaries do not record *rooves* as an alternative plural form of *roof*, the stated or implied plural being *roofs*. Questioned as to their usage, 76 of 139 informants claimed to use *rooves*, 63 *roofs*. For the plural of *hoof* 89 offered *hooves*, and 50 *hoofs*. The latter is the form offered by the dictionaries, though some list the former as a "rare" variant. Whether or not the extensive use of *rooves* and *hooves* reflects a grammatical usage peculiarly Canadian has not been determined; personally, I would be inclined to doubt it, in spite of the dictionaries.

¹⁵In discussing the divergence between the British "broad a" and the American "flat a", H. L. Mencken, in *The American Language* (New York, 1937), p. 338, claims that in Canada the American has displaced the British pronunciation. This conclusion is highly questionable, for there is no reason to believe that the British "broad a" was ever generally used in Canadian popular speech.

¹⁶See Raven I. McDavid Jr., "h before Semivowels in the United States," *Language*, 28 (1952), 41-62.

¹⁷See E. Bagby Atwood, "Grease and Greasy: A Study of Geographical Variation," *Univ. of Texas Studies in English*, 29 (1950), 251-3.

¹⁸There are of course a large number of items which are similarly pronounced by most speakers of American and Canadian English but which are differently pronounced by most speakers of Standard British English. In the following examples the usual North

American pronunciation is given first: *privacy* /'pralvəsi/, /'prɪvəsi/; *solder* /'sədər/, /'sɔldə/; *questionnaire*, /kwestʃən'ær/, /,kɛstʃən'ɛə/; *garage* /gə'ræʒ/ or /gə'rædʒ/, /'gærəʒ/ or /'gærɪdʒ/ (frequently heard in Ontario is /ge'raedʒ/, a pronunciation not recorded in the dictionaries); *says* /sez/, /sez/; *abdomen* /'æbdəmən/, /æb'domən/; *secretary* /'sek̩rət̩ri/, /'sek̩ret̩rɪ/ (the secondary /'sek̩ən,dərɪ/ stress on the penultimate syllable of similar words ending in -*ory*, -*ary*, *dictionary*, *ordinary*, *obligatory*, *reformatory*, etc., is characteristic of American and Canadian English). Needless to say, this list could be lengthened considerably and no doubt another (probably shorter) could be compiled of words pronounced by Canadians after the British fashion. Such compilations would have value as a basis for a long overdue survey of Canadian pronunciation.

¹⁹For discussions of this phenomenon in the United States see Victor A. Oswald, Jr., "Voiced t —A Misnomer," *American Speech*, XVIII (1943), 18-25; and W. P. Lehmann, "A Note on the Change of American English /t/," *American Speech*, XXVII (1953), 271-5.

QUELQUES ASPECTS PEU ÉTUDIÉS DU FRANÇAIS CANADIEN

by

Gérard Tougas, University of British Columbia

Depuis 1893, date à laquelle James Geddes, professeur à l'Université de Boston, se mit à étudier les parlers populaires du Canada français,¹ de nombreux enquêteurs l'ont suivi dans cette voie. En revanche, nous ne connaissons aucune étude détaillée sur la langue des classes instruites. Or, il suffit d'une pratique limitée de l'élite canadienne française pour s'apercevoir que sa langue, du seul point de vue de la prononciation, est loin d'être uniforme. Charles Bruneau, qui qualifie la langue des Canadiens cultivés "d'impeccable" ne fait que laisser le problème entier.² Puisque l'auditeur attentif peut déceler chez l'élite canadienne une gamme considérable d'accents, il s'ensuit qu'on ne trouve pas encore au Canada français, comme en France, une norme qui soit considérée comme la marque de l'homme instruit. Il semble toutefois que l'influence exercée par la radio, la télévision et certaines sociétés comme la Société du Bon Parler nous permette d'entrevoir quelle sera, au Canada, la langue parlée de demain. Pour ce faire, il est indispensable de revoir quelle idée les Canadiens français se sont faite dans le passé du bon usage et de l'accent qui convient à l'honnête homme.

Puisque la science linguistique, ou comme l'on disait hier encore, la philologie, n'a guère plus d'un siècle d'existence, les éducateurs canadiens qui, avant 1850, ont voulu "corriger" les fautes de leurs compatriotes devaient fatallement se reporter à l'usage courant en France. Une dispute, survenue en 1842 entre l'abbé Demers et l'abbé Maguire³ jette une très intéressante lumière sur la conception que l'on pouvait se faire il y a plus d'une siècle de cet usage.

Sont proscrits les mots et locutions qui, de provenance authentiquement française, n'ont plus cours en France. C'est ainsi qu'il est conseillé aux Canadiens qui voudraient se perfectionner dans l'art du bien dire d'éviter "éclairez à Monsieur" qui est une vieille locution "dont on ne doit plus faire usage."⁴ L'on devine bien quel devait être l'objet du

différend qui opposa les deux ecclésiastiques: de quel usage s'agissait-il? Le cas de la diphongue *oi* telle qu'on la trouve dans les mots *moi, toi* devait paraître insoluble. L'abbé Maguire préconise "moi, moë: droit, droë: je crois, je croë..." Puis il ajoute "Or, je demande au lecteur si ce n'est pas ainsi que les personnes instruites prononcent en Canada?" L'abbé Demers, au contraire, voudrait imposer la prononciation *moa, droa, je croa.*⁵ D'après les observations de l'abbé Maguire, il appert que sous Louis-Philippe, les deux prononciations s'entendaient toujours à Paris. Son explication ne manque pas de perspicacité: "...il arrive tous les jours dans la capitale artistes, écrivains, qui ont reçu leur éducation dans différentes parties de la France et qui comme Vaugelas, ne peuvent jamais se défaire du reste de leur accent provincial. Cette observation explique pourquoi on remarque une si grande différence de prononciation dans la Chambre des députés à Paris, et pourquoi cette différence est beaucoup moins considérable dans la Chambre des Pairs."⁶ Logiquement, cette constatation eût dû l'amener à préférer la prononciation des Parisiens cultivés. Il ne semble pas qu'il ait songé à en faire une règle.

Si l'on tient compte de l'état des communications entre la France et le Canada à l'époque et des très rares Canadiens qui pouvaient se permettre le luxe d'un voyage en France, l'on conçoit, dans ces conditions, que tout effort pour améliorer le français des Canadiens devait rester sans effet, d'autant que les réformateurs ne pouvaient tomber d'accord sur l'usage à suivre. Une difficulté plus grande encore, que les deux abbés ne mentionnent pas, se fera sentir à mesure que nous avancerons dans le siècle. A vouloir calquer le français canadien sur le français de France, l'on s'assignait une tâche d'autant moins réalisable que les Canadiens se fussent condamnés, au mieux, à être éternellement en retard des changements linguistiques survenus en France. Mais pour comprendre ce fait, qui nous semble évident aujourd'hui, il a fallu quelques générations de linguistes pour mettre en évidence que toute langue parlée évolue constamment.

C'est vers cette même époque également, qu'après un siècle de vie anglaise, les Canadiens de passage en France, comme du reste les Français faisant un séjour au Canada, purent mesurer la distance linguistique qui séparait désormais les deux pays. Dans son *Charles Guérin* (1853) Pierre Chauveau nous fait assister à la déconvenue de Pierre Guérin qui se trouve presque un étranger en France. Il fait annoncer

dans un journal qu'un jeune Américain, possédant à fond la langue française, cherche à donner des leçons d'anglais. "Il se présenta plusieurs élèves et l'on trouva que je parlais très bien le français *pour un américain*. Je songeai que si jamais j'allais m'échouer en Angleterre, je jouerais le même rôle en sens inverse. On trouverait là que je parle bon anglais *pour un français!*"⁷

A ce témoignage éloquent ajoutons celui-ci, qui lui fait pendant. Lorsque Gérin-Lajoie, auteur de *Jean Rivard* se rendit en 1844 à New-York, un Français à qui il rendit visite lui conseilla, s'il voulait se faire professeur de français, de se dire Français "parce qu'on ne croirait jamais à New-York qu'un Canadien pût enseigner la langue française."⁸

Or, les efforts déployés au 19e siècle par les éducateurs afin de faire prévaloir, au Canada, un usage français qu'ils ne réussissaient pas toujours à déterminer, et la réaction des étrangers devant la prononciation canadienne devaient fatallement provoquer, chez les sujets parlants canadiens une réaction défensive. Nous nous trouvons ici en présence d'une constante dans l'évolution des langues. De même que le prestige de Paris et de la royauté devait assurer, au moyen âge, la suprématie du francien sur les autres dialectes, de même, au 19e siècle, le rayonnement de la France laissait peu de place au français canadien. Mais puisque la grammaire traditionnelle est la concrétisation de la victoire d'un dialecte sur un autre et que la prononciation de l'honnête homme reflète des conquêtes militaires et culturelles remportées par un groupe linguistique déterminé, il résulte que de grands changements politiques sont susceptibles de modifier la réaction des hommes devant certaines formes d'une langue, jusque là peu estimées.

Le cas le plus frappant de cette valorisation d'une forme particulière d'une langue nous est fourni par la langue anglaise telle qu'elle se parle aux Etats-Unis. Pendant tout le 19e siècle, les Américains ont fait sourire les Anglais quand ils n'attiraient pas sur eux les foudres des puristes d'Oxford et de Cambridge. Depuis, les Anglais se sont non seulement habitués à l'accent et aux innovations linguistiques des Américains, mais encore la connaissance de l'argot américain se généralise parmi des couches de plus en plus étendues de la société anglaise. Ce fait nous permet d'apprécier l'énorme importance de *l'habitude*. Par leur extraordinaire puissance de pénétration culturelle, les Américains habituent leurs auditeurs européens à entendre l'américain. Une fois l'effet de

surprise dépassé, l'on entre dans une seconde phase au bout de laquelle la langue est accréditée, nous dirions ennoblie. La rapidité du processus sera fonction de nombreux facteurs, parmi lesquels l'activité intellectuelle et artistique d'un groupe linguistique est de la plus haute importance. La création, aux Etats-Unis d'une littérature, d'une philosophie, d'une musique originales et l'influence qu'exercent actuellement les Américains dans les domaines politique, économique et scientifique ont contribué puissamment à rendre grammaticaux bien des "barbarismes" et à adoucir à l'oreille de l'Anglais cultivé les détestables prononciations d'hier.

En ce qui concerne le Canada français, nous assistons, dans cette seconde moitié de 20e siècle, à un processus analogue, qui se développe à un rythme beaucoup moins rapide, eu égard à la faiblesse numérique des Canadiens français et à un rayonnement culturel très faible. Il a suffi pourtant que depuis une vingtaine d'années la littérature canadienne française, jusque là à la remorque de la production littéraire française, se libère et fasse connaître le Canada à l'étranger, que l'essor industriel du pays porte aux extrémités du monde la connaissance du Canada et des deux races qui le composent et qu'enfin, grâce à un niveau de vie élevé, les Canadiens partent de plus en plus nombreux chaque année en Europe *habiter* les Européens à entendre le français canadien pour que le même processus soit amorcé. Nous ne saurions dire, il est vrai, que l'effet de surprise soit dépassé. Mais qui ne voit qu'il s'agit ici essentiellement du même phénomène linguistique auquel nous venons de faire allusion?

Rappelons ce qu'énonçait en 1911 Antoine Meillet au sujet de la différentiation des langues:

Après avoir longtemps cherché de tous côtés le développement naturel du langage, les linguistes ont fini par reconnaître qu'on ne l'observe exactement nulle part et que toutes les langues connues, populaires ou savantes, trahissent la préoccupation d'un mieux dire qui partout a conduit les sujets parlants à emprunter le langage de ceux qui sont censés parler mieux. Chaque différentiation est tôt ou tard, et parfois immédiatement, suivie d'une réaction qui tend à rétablir ou à instaurer l'unité de langue là où il y a unité de civilisation.¹⁰

L'unité de langue au Canada français est la langue populaire, communément appelée le *canayen*. Le danger qu'entre

les Canadiens cultivés et le peuple il se creuse un fossé linguistique infranchissable est imaginaire, car dans ce genre de lutte c'est toujours le peuple qui a gain de cause. Cependant, par la radio, la télévision, le cinéma, s'opèrent dans la langue de peuple des modifications qui, assimilées, porteront "l'unité de langue" à un palier supérieur. Que la diphthongue *oi* ne soit plus universellement prononcée à l'ancienne manière est la preuve qu'il s'opère insensiblement, après une période de divergences grandissantes, un rapprochement linguistique entre la France et le Canada. C'est à travers l'élite canadienne que se produisent ces changements et c'est pourquoi l'on discerne chez elle un certain flottement dans la prononciation.¹¹ Il est tout probable qu'au fur et à mesure que le Canada se développera, il se créera chez cette élite une langue parlée qui pourra être plus aisément caractérisée qu'aujourd'hui parce qu'elle se sera uniformisée à un niveau situé entre le *canayen* et la langue du *Français cultivé*.

NOTES

¹James Geddes, *American French Dialect Comparison. Two Acadian-French dialects compared with the dialect of Ste Anne de Beaupré.* Baltimore, 1893, pp. 22.

American French Dialect Comparison. Acadian-French dialects compared with some specimens of a Canadian-French dialect spoken in Maine. Baltimore, 1898, pp. 24.

²Charles Bruneau, *Grammaire et stylistique*, Montréal: Éditions Bernard Valiquette, 1940, p. 16.

³Dionne, N. E., *Une dispute grammaticale en 1842*, Québec: Laflamme et Proulx, 1912, pp. 229.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 196.

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷Pierre Chauveau, *Charles Guérin*, Montreal: John Lovell, 1853, p. 313.

⁸Abbé H. R. Casgrain, *Oeuvres complètes*, Montréal: Beau-chemin 1896, tome 2, p. 463.

⁹L'on trouvera dans *The American Language* de H. L. Mencken (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923) l'histoire des réactions anglaises devant la langue américaine.

¹⁰Antoine Meillet, *Differentiation et unification dans les langues*, Scientia, IX, 1911, p. 419.

¹¹Nous n'avons cherché dans cette brève étude qu'à signaler un phénomène linguistique, peu étudié jusqu'ici. Aussi avons-nous évité de préciser la nature de ce "flottement". Mentionnons toutefois un seul exemple à l'appui de notre thèse: on remarque, chez le Canadien cultivé, la tendance à éviter l'affrication des dentales devant *i* et *u*. Cette caractéristique varie d'un sujet parlant à l'autre; bien plus, il est rare qu'un même sujet, qui en principe fuit ces affrications, le fasse d'une façon systématique.

FREQUENCY OF CONSONANT CLUSTERS IN FRENCH

by

G. L. Bursill-Hall, University of British Columbia

0.1 In a recent article in *Language*,⁽¹⁾ Sol Saporta pointed out that structural linguists had, for the most part, analysed sequences of phonemes but had ignored the frequencies of combinations. He goes on to produce an interesting and workable hypothesis, i.e. "the average frequency of a consonant cluster is a function of the difference between the phonemes in the cluster; low frequencies are expected for clusters which are either extremely similar or extremely dissimilar; high frequencies are expected for clusters which are at neither extreme." What should be demonstrated by scholars of linguistics is that the frequency of these combinations is not haphazard.

0.2. These notes were written to support Saporta's thesis with reference to the frequency of consonantal clusters in French; how far can his approach be applied to French phonemic combinations? His analysis was for English and Spanish; he said also, that before his hypothesis could pass beyond the suggestive stage, other languages should be exhaustively and scientifically analysed. These results must be interpreted as only a partial confirmation of his results, and here we can only say that our figures compare favourably with his.

1.0 One 'text' has been used; I did start my investigation from an examination of all the consonantal clusters found in the *Nouveau Petit Larousse Illustré*, but when all clusters containing a liquid were removed, I still had to contend with a corpus of more than 9000 clusters. In order to make a comparison with Saporta's analysis of English consonantal clusters more realistic, the corpus had to be greatly reduced; (Saporta had used a corpus which contained only 837 clusters). I reduced mine to approximately 5000 clusters by using the *Harrap's Shorter French and English Dictionary*, and a further reduction was made by using the *Vander Beke French Word Book*⁽²⁾ which yielded 1055 clusters in all. This is quite in keeping with

Guiraud's statement⁽³⁾: "nous avons admis la possibilité d'une distribution de la forme /pr⁻¹ = C/ à l'intérieur du lexique et dont la distribution à l'intérieur du vocabulaire d'un texte ne serait que le reflet." This I mention, as the size of the corpus would not appear to be of paramount importance, since the ratio of the clusters in terms of the different categories remained, to all intents and purposes, constant, the only serious deviation from the distribution curve being in the case of the category resulting from clusters in which the phonemes differ as much as possible.

1.1 Trnka wrote that there appear to be certain general laws which apply to the combinations of consonants; he goes on to say that "phonemes differentiated by a mark of correlation never combine in the same morpheme... Thus we do not find such consonantal combinations as [pf, fp, tθ, ðt] and [pb, td, kg], etc. in those languages where the correlations of plosion or voice exist, e.g. in Anglo-Saxon and Modern English."⁽⁴⁾ This rule, he calls, the law of the *minimal phonological contrast*.

1.2 A further refinement of the analysis of such groups became possible with the discoveries of Professor Roman Jakobson and his associates on the distinctive features.⁽⁵⁾ N. S. Trubetzkoy had already pointed out⁽⁶⁾ that Trnka could not succeed in postulating general laws for phonemic combinations since "il partait de la vieille classification, déjà dépassée, des oppositions phonologiques en corrélations et en disjonctions." It is clear that in the description of phonemic combinations, it is not enough to start from the 'minimal phonological contrast' and work one's way up; Jakobson teaches that there must be a determined order in the analytic description of the phonemes of a language and that we must begin to deduce laws of phonemic combinations from the hierarchy of these distinctive features. Trubetzkoy emphasised that the various phonemic combinations are subject to the laws which are peculiar to each language and these laws must be established separately. This is logical, since the phonemic inventory of different languages will differ in the same way as the distinctive features of different phonemes will vary from language to language, e.g. the contrast 'strident/mellow' applies to all French constrictives and stops, whereas in English this contrast does not operate for [f, p, v, b]. This will not necessarily affect the frequency of the phonemic combinations

involved but serves to change the nature of the categories of phonemes and their relationship to the other categories of combinations.

1.3 The phonemes of Modern French can be broken down into the distinctive features which are 'the ultimate discrete signals'. Jakobson claims a definite hierarchy in such an analysis: "(i) the identification of the fundamental source features (1, 2), i. e. consonant, vowel, glide, liquid; (ii) the super-position of resonance features in vowels and consonants presents the following order: (A) the compactness feature (3) encompasses all vowels and consonants; (B) the gravity feature (4) concerns all vowels and compact consonants whereby the analysis of the acute vowels is exhausted; (C) the flattening feature is confined to grave vowels and terminates their analysis, while (D) the nasality feature (5) affects the consonants and the vowels and concludes the identification of the nasals; finally the tenseness feature (6) concerns all phonemes without a vocalic and nasal feature, i. e. the oral consonants and the glides. (iii) the secondary source features (7,8) characterise the oral consonants alone." Jakobson adds that features 5, 7, 8 must be determined before 3,4.

1.4 There are no fewer than twelve binary oppositions in the distinctive features of the phonemes of a language, i. e. (i) vocalic/non-vocalic, (ii) consonantal/non-consonantal, (iii) interrupted/continuant, (iv) checked/unchecked, (v) strident/mellow, (vi) voiced/unvoiced, (vii) compact/diffuse, (viii) grave/acute, (ix) flat/plain, (x) sharp/plain, (xi) tense/lax, (xii) nasal/oral. Jakobson says that no language uses all these features, and indeed as far as the consonants of the French language under consideration are concerned, only eight are actually used. This can be said because all liquids, vowels and semivowels (or glides) are omitted from our analysis; they use features which the consonants do not. In the case of the liquids /l, R/, special consideration is required of the problems involving their combination with other consonants; *these possess both consonantal and vocalic features*. The feature 'voiced/unvoiced' has been intentionally omitted because this is now being more and more regarded as a concomitant factor of the feature 'lax/tense'. Jakobson states: "This hierarchy is illustrated, for instance, by the French pattern, where [z̥] the voiced, lax consonant of such forms as 'tu la jettes', becomes a voiceless lax [z̥] before the voiceless [t] in 'vous la

jetez', but is still distinguished from [š], the voiceless tense in 'vous l'achetez'."

1.32 The phonemes of French can be analysed thus:

	b	p	d	t	g	k	v	f	z	s	ž	š	m	n	ñ
Consonant/															
1 Non-Consonant	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Vowel/	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 Non-Vowel															
Compact/	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
3 Diffuse															
Grave/															
4 Acute	+	+	-	-			+	+	-	-			+	-	
Oral/															
5 Nasal	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
Tense/															
6 Lax	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+			
Continuant/															
7 Interrupted	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+			
Strident/															
8 Mellow	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+			

1.4 Saporta listed the consonant phonemes of English in terms of the units of difference between them. By reference to the table above, it will be seen, for instance, that /b/ and /d/ possess all the same distinctive features except the contrast of 'grave/acute'; this can be considered as a difference of two units. Similarly the phonemes /b/ and /g/ possess the same distinctive features except 'compact/diffuse' and 'grave/acute', the latter contrast being irrelevant in the case of /g/; this 'semi-contrast' can be considered as one unit of difference, so that the phonemes /b/ and /d/ show two units of difference, whereas /b/ and /g/ show three units of difference. This system of listing can be applied to all the consonantal phonemes of Modern orthoepic French. A unit difference between certain English and French phonemes becomes immediately apparent. Saporta points out that the English phonemes /p/ and /t/ show the same features except for the contrast of 'grave/acute', which in the case of /p/ is 'plus' and 'minus' for /t/, and the contrast of 'strident/mellow', which is 'minus' for /t/ but irrelevant for /p/. In the case of French, the contrast of 'strident/mellow' operates for all the oral consonants, so that /p/ and /t/ show all the same distinctive features except 'grave/acute'. The result is that the English

phonemes /p/ and /t/ show *three* units of difference, but in French they show only *two* units; the absence or presence of the 'strident/mellow' feature will of course have an affect on the differences between other consonants, e.g. English* /p/ and /m/ show *four* units of difference, but in French they show *five* units, since this feature is irrelevant in the case of /m/.

1.5 Some problems require further explanation; any cluster containing a liquid or a semivowel has not been considered. In clusters with a sequence of /ksp/, e.g. *exporter* [ekspɔʁte], we see an occurrence of the cluster [ks] followed by the cluster [sp]; in a tri-membral sequence containing a liquid, i.e. /str/, we see one cluster only, i.e. /st/, and have ignored the /R/ element, e.g. *monstre* [mɔ̃str]. As for a sequence such as /rtm/, may one ignore the /R/ element and consider this a sequence of /tm/, e.g. *fortement* [fɔ̃Rtmā]? To do this, we might have invoked the so-called Malécot law,⁽⁷⁾ i.e. that the mute-e will be elided when the aperture of the first consonant is greater than that of the second and when the points of articulation follow in a sequence. Jakobson says that "the liquids /r/ and /l/ are complexes combining the consonantal characteristic with a vocalic one"⁽⁸⁾; (he himself quotes Sweet according to whom they are 'vowel-like consonants'). As a result, I have interpreted the sequence /rtm/ as /tCC/, leaving the sequence /tm/; similarly, a liquid occurring between two consonants, i.e. /pləm/, e.g. *amplement* [apləmā], is interpreted as a sequence of /C+C/, which makes the cluster, in this case /pm/, impossible. Moreover, no attempt is made to consider the position of the cluster, i.e. initial, medial, final, since all the clusters under consideration occur in medial position, and some (but by no means all) occur in initial and/or final position as well, e.g. /st/.

1.6 With Saporta, I have ignored syllable boundaries. Miss Fischer-Jørgensen⁽⁹⁾ has pointed out that most, but not all syllables can be found as utterances; 'utterance' is taken to mean "the first unit met with in the analysis, the parts (i.e. the immediate constituents) of which cannot all function as the whole unit." The problem is that in many languages, of which French is one, there is no relationship between the syllable base and the minimal unit capable of constituting an utterance; as a consequence, the solution of medial clusters remains a

*Allophonic aspiration of the English stops is irrelevant in this connection.

perplexing one. All syllabic and other sutural devices have not here been taken into account. It is more satisfactory to establish the nature of the phonemes in terms of their distinctive features and to refer to their powers of combination only insofar as the 'word' is concerned. With the exception of /ʃ/, all the consonantal phonemes of French occur in both initial and final positions. By avoiding the problems involving juncture, I can list the cluster /tš/ as it occurs in *caoutchouc* [kautšu] and at the same time disregard the fact that this same cluster has a much greater functional yield as an oristic device, e.g. *toute chose* [tutšoz], etc.

1.61 Of the 210 theoretically possible clusters, only 48 occur in the text examined; this is not fortuitous but a fact of structure demonstrated by the number of pairs of clusters lacking in the inventory, i.e. 66 pairs. It might be added that of the remaining 78 phonemes, 18 operate in pairs; a principal weakness in Saporta's theory is that it loses sight of the importance of such structural factors and their functional yield. The occurrence of some clusters as part of paradigmatic morphemes has been ignored; Arnold⁽¹⁰⁾ stresses that the lack of consonantal morphemic agglutination prevents the emergence of many final consonant clusters. I have not ascribed too much importance to the fact that certain clusters occur with a relatively high frequency, i.e. /st/, /kt/, /sp/, /ks/. Saporta indicates, rightly I think, that, as I mentioned previously, the result of the distribution of some allomorphs is to divide the effort evenly between the speaker and the listener. This is probably true of certain lexical morphemes, i.e. /st/, e.g. *artiste* [artist], *egoïste* [egoist].

1.62 Here, however, we may discern a flaw in Saporta's hypothesis. It is content with an indication of cluster frequency, but gives no statistical indication of the functional yield of the clusters, the relative burdens of which are left unclarified. This method of analysis has been based in the first place on experimental data, but it can surely be of real value only if it is systematically applied to phonemic and phonological analyses. An analysis in terms of the distinctive features of the phonemes of a language may be considered the first step. This must be followed by the classification according to their commutability and then according to their possi-

bilities of combination, i.e. their distribution. Saporta's theory does not do this; for no explanation can be given, why of the 210 theoretically possible clusters or the 48 actual clusters, 6 clusters account for 728 out of the 1055 clusters or 69%, which actually occurred in the text I used.

1.63 In addition, this hypothesis cannot explain that these 6 clusters, i.e. /kt/, /st/, 'sp/, /ps/, /ks/, /sk/ do not possess equal power; in my text there are 95 examples of /kt/, 258 examples of /st/, 96 examples of /sp/, 49 examples of /ps/, 157 examples of /ks/ and 73 examples of /sk/. There are no examples of /tp/ or /tk/, only two of /ts/, and there are almost twice as many examples of /sp/ and /ks/ as there are of /ps/ and /sk/; this ratio applies to the larger texts mentioned earlier in this paper. Saporta's theory ignores this discrepancy; his whole theory rests on the argument that for the listener, the best situation occurs when the members of a cluster differ as much as possible and vice versa for the speaker. But by his analysis /tk/, /ts/, /ps/, /sk/ represent the same elements and show the same units of difference as their counterparts; to me this alone does not explain the difference in their functional burden. Saporta's hypothesis seems to require a more exhaustive examination of the functional burden of these clusters and some statement, despite my earlier disclaimers, of their relative yield in the various possible positions. It is interesting to note that despite the difference in total frequency between /sk/ and /ks/, 42% of the yield of /sk/ occur in the initial or the final positions, whereas in the case of /ks/, none occur in the initial position and only 5% in the final position.

2.0 Table 1 shows the difference between each of the fifteen French consonant phonemes and each of the others. Table 2 shows the relative frequency of the cluster found in the text. *A* shows the difference in units according to the analysis of distinctive features between members of a cluster; *B* lists the number of theoretically possible clusters according to each degree of difference, 210 in all; *D* gives the frequency of clusters of each degree found in the text, 1055 in all; *E* gives the average number of clusters in each category, i.e. *D* divided by *B*. To Saporta's pattern is added the column *C* showing the number of different clusters employed in each category: column *F* shows the percentage average of each category.

Table 1: French Phonemes - Units of Difference.

	b	p	d	t	g	k	v	f	z	s	ž	š	m	n	ñ
b	-														
p	2	-													
d	2	4	-												
t	4	2	2	-											
g	3	5	3	5	-										
k	5	3	5	3	5	-									
v	4	6	6	8	7	9	-								
f	6	4	8	6	9	7	2	-							
z	6	8	4	6	7	9	2	4	-						
s	8	6	6	4	9	7	4	2	2	-					
ž	7	9	7	9	4	6	3	5	3	5	-				
š	9	7	9	7	6	4	5	3	5	3	2	-			
m	5	5	7	7	8	8	5	5	7	7	8	8	-		
n	7	7	5	5	8	8	7	7	5	5	8	8	2	-	
ñ	8	8	8	8	5	5	8	8	8	8	5	5	3	3	-

Table 2

A	B	C	D	E	F
0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
1	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
2	22	5	64	2.9	6.7
3	20	3	99	4.9	11.3
4	20	5	267	13.4	30.9
5	40	7	34	0.9	2.1
6	20	6	151	7.6	17.6
7	32	16	405	12.7	29.3
8	40	6	35	0.9	2.1
9	16	0	0	0.0	0.0

I have avoided the listing of clusters with no units of difference such as geminates, because gemination is at best only of peripheral interest in French, 'intimant' is discrete from 'intimentement', but another way of indicating this discreteness is by articulating the [ə] - evidently a spelling pronunciation. In any case, the numbers of geminated clusters are too few to affect the frequency ratio. It seems clear that gemination has a phonological value in French, but this belongs to the

'Satzphonologie', e.g. *je le lis* [ʃɛlli] as compared to *je lis* [ʃɛli].

2.1 Table 3 shows the position and ratio for the consonantal clusters of English; this I have taken directly from Saporta's article; column E has been added to indicate the percentage average frequency of each category; it does not show the actual number of different clusters used in each category, as shown in column D for the table of French phonemes.

A	B	C	D	E
0	19	0	0.0	0.0
1	0	0	0.0	0.0
2	38	8	0.2	1.3
3	24	29	1.2	7.9
4	48	244	5.1	33.8
5	72	390	5.4	35.8
6	40	16	0.4	2.7
7	60	113	1.9	12.6
8	48	35	0.7	4.6
9	12	2	0.2	1.3

2.2 An examination of both tables indicates that the two languages have frequencies paralleling each other almost exactly. Saporta rightly reported that they appear to reflect the efforts of the encoder and the decoder, i.e. the speaker and the listener. One apparent difference between the frequencies for English and French can be quickly resolved; in both languages there is one category with approximately the same low yield, i.e. 5 in French and 6 in English. The contrast 'student/mellow' does not operate in English for labials, therefore there is a difference of 5 units between /s/ and /p/; in French, this contrast *does* operate, so that there will be a difference of 6 units between /s/ and /p/. Therefore the clusters [sp] and [ps] have a heavy yield in English in category 5 and in French in category 6. Similar comparisons could be made of the relative burdens of clusters with /s/ (possessing the same distinctive features in both languages). The cluster /st/ is in the same category in either language; in English it has a very heavy yield, and in French it appears 258 times; similarly the clusters /sk/ and /ks/ are in the same category; they have a

heavy yield in English, and in French they together occur 230 times. One final point in this connection: the absence in English and the presence in French of the contrast 'strident/mellow' means that in French there will be a difference of 2 units between /p/ and /t/ but in English this difference is 3 units. This will account for the fact that French has a higher frequency ratio in category 2 than English has, since both languages make considerable use of the cluster /pt/.

3.0 Saporta showed that in the main, clusters with higher frequencies had differences of 4 to 5 units, but that those clusters showing either much smaller or much greater differences do not occur; such clusters would involve a much greater effort on the part of either the speaker or the listener. This is demonstrated by analysing cluster frequency in terms of basic physiological nature, i. e. S = Stop, D = Durative. Clusters which are SS are confined to the lower categories of 2 and 3 and demonstrate clearly that a stop such as /kt/ gives no trouble to the speaker: clusters of the type DD are more evenly distributed, while the types DS and SD are confined to categories 4, 6 and 7. This indicates that encoder and decoder effort is more or less equally divided. This analysis is, in itself, probably inadequate but is useful support for the linguistic hypothesis of 'least effort'.

3.1 Saporta suggests that an alternative analysis can yield interesting results; he says that affricates should be construed as clusters. He follows Jakobson's theory that strident constrictives and mellow stops, and corresponding strident stops and mellow constrictives are amenable to a single opposition, i. e. optimal constrictive vs. optimal stop; such a complex unit as a strident stop or mellow constrictive would be symbolised '+'. Jakobson states that it is preferable to deal with simple two-choice situations and to exclude complexes.

3.11 Saporta also maintains that in this alternative analysis, the feature 'strident/mellow' becomes irrelevant; this is difficult to see. This is one of the basic features of the dichotomous scale, and Halle has pointed out, by implication, that this feature is fundamental, that in the analysis of a consonantal system it follows immediately after the division 'continuant/interrupted'. Halle adds ⁽¹¹⁾: "The increase in dimensionality brought with it a corresponding decrease in the number of 'significant' points of articulation. (As a matter of fact it was

shown that four such points sufficed for all languages)." If this contrast 'strident/mellow' should be ignored, the result will be, if Jakobson is to be correctly understood, that this contrast should become one with the 'continuant/interrupted' feature; this would then become the feature 'optimal constrictive/optimal stop'; in this case /d/ would be symbolised 'minus', /z/ would be symbolised 'plus' and /ʃ/ would be symbolised +/-; therefore the sequence /d z/ will now show a difference of 5, not 6 as Saporta claims, and the sequence /d ʃ/ (if we are going to retain the affricates) will show a difference of 4. It would seem that the feature 'strident/mellow' still remains distinctive, especially as Jakobson has pointed out that "with a fusing of both oppositions, the stridency feature *may* become redundant *if some of the stop phonemes, at least under certain conditions, are represented by affricates*. In the analysing of the affricates as clusters, it is hard to see how this last condition can be defended.

4.0 *Conclusion.* Saporta's thesis is that if his theory has any validity, the structural linguist must examine any deviation from the curve and revise his description. This is naturally essential; I could not find any cause for the deviation in French and indeed I am disinclined to accept his argument. I consider this as two smaller curves; they are both seemingly perfect, the first being the curve for speaker effort and the second being the curve for listener effort. The same argument may be applied to Saporta's first table, and here too, there is an almost perfect curve for speaker effort and a second almost perfect curve for listener effort.

4.1 I think that if Saporta had recorded his alternative phonemic analysis in terms of a speaker curve and a listener curve, he would have given a much more accurate account of consonantal cluster frequency. By analysing the affricates /č/ and /ʃ/ as clusters, he might have added to category 7; if he had fused the contrasts 'continuant/interrupted' and 'strident/mellow' (as I have already suggested), he might have added to category 5. He has alas removed the feature 'strident/mellow', the clusters /tš/ and /dž/ have been placed in category 6, and category 7 has been merely weakened. The clusters in question (and the affricates alone) have a high functional yield in English, but being already complex they do not readily combine with other consonants; in French the combinations /tš/ and /dž/ have an extremely low yield; there are four instances of /dž/ ,

If
ult
is
d'
c-
'
ed
ce
ve
4.
ns
th
ne
-
s-
st

three of /št/, and one of /ts/. If the 'strident/mellow' feature were removed from the phonemes /ž/ and /š/, we might have made a slight difference in the ratios for categories 6 and 7, but if this feature had been removed from the phonemes /g/ and /k/, as done by Saporta, the results would have been very different; unfortunately Saporta does not make this clear in his description of the behaviour of the feature 'strident/mellow'. Does he mean this to be applied to the phonemes /š, ž, k, g/ or to all the other phonemes as well which show this contrast, i.e. /s, θ, t, z, ð, d/? This cannot be applied to French, since the present form of the language has no affricate phonemes and since Jakobson now claims that "in French all constrictives are strident /f, v, s, z, š, ž/ and all stops mellow /p, b, t, d, k, g/".

References:

- (1) Saporta, S., "Frequency of Consonant Clusters", *Language* 31.1 (1955), 25-30.
- (2) Vander Beke, G. E., *French Word Book*, Publications of the American & Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, New York, 1929.
- (3) Guiraud, P., *Les Caractères statistiques du vocabulaire*. Paris, 1954 (p. 25).
- (4) Trnka, B., "General Laws of Phonemic Combinations", *TCLP* VI (1936), 57-62.
- (5) Jakobson, R., Fant, C.G.M. & Halle, M., *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis: The Distinctive Features and their Correlates*. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- (6) Troubetzkoy, N.S., *Principes de Phonologie* (Traduction J. Cantineau). Paris, 1949.
- (7) Malécot, A., "The Elision of the French Mute-e within Consonantal Clusters", *Lingua* V. 1 (1955), 45-60.
- (8) Jakobson, R. & Lotz, J., "Notes on the French Phonemic Pattern", *Word* V. 2 (1949), 151-8.
- (9) Fischer-Jørgensen, E., "On the Definition of Phoneme Categories on a Distributional Basis", *Acta Linguistica VII. 1-2* (1952), 8-39.
- (10) Arnold, G., "A Phonological Approach to Vowel, Consonant and Syllable in Modern French", *Lingua* V. 3 (1956), 253-287.
- (11) Halle, M., "The Strategy of Phonemics", *Word* X. 2-3 (1954), 197-209.

LINGUISTICA CANADIANA

A LINGUISTIC BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1955 & SUPPLEMENT FOR PREVIOUS YEARS.⁽¹⁾

I. GENERAL WRITINGS / GENERALITES.

J. B. Rudnyc'kyj & J.-P. Vinay

[Abbreviations: CMLAR = Canadian Modern Language Association Review, Toronto; JCLA = Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association; JdT = Journal des Traducteurs (Montréal); VK = Vira y Kul'tura; UVAN - Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, Winnipeg]

- [----] "American Bibliography, 1955", *Publ. Modern Language Association of America*, 71.2, New York, 1956. /JCLA now included on the master list of periodicals/.
- Lunn, Jean, ed., *Canadiana* 1955. Ottawa, National Library of Canada, 1955.
- Chatwin, D. B., ed., *Canadian Index* 1955. Ottawa, Canadian Library Association.
- Barclay, E. C., "Folks, we're backward!", CMLAR 11.4 (1955), 5-6.
- Borows'kyj, M., *Ukrainian Topo- and Anthroponymy in the International Botanical Terminology*. Onomastica, UVAN, No. 9 (1955).
- Daviault, Pierre, *Traduction. Notes de traduction*, publiées par tranches dans *La Nouvelle Revue Canadienne*, Ottawa, II.3 (1952) -
- Hawkins, S. C. M., "The 'Ecole Annexe' of Macdonald College", CMLAR 12.1 (1955), 19.
- Klinck, G. A., "How to set a fair examination", CMLAR 12.1 (1955), 20-21.
- Rudnyc'kyj, J. B., *Slavische und indogermanische Akzentdubletten. Slavistica*, UVAN, No. 22 (1955).
- , "Ivan Velyhors'kyj (1889-1955)", *Orbis* (Louvain) IV. 2 (1955), 571-573.
- , *Toponymic Neologisms in Canada*. Cinquième Congrès international de Sciences Onomastiques, Salamanque. Programme & communications, 1955. p. 66.
- , "Bibliographia onomastica 1953: Canada", *Onoma* (Louvain) V. (1954), p. 168.
- , "General Writings. A Linguistic Bibliography", JCLA 1.2 (1955), 21-2.
- , "Canadian Slavic and Languages other than English and French. A Linguistic Bibliography", JCLA 1.2 (1955), 20-1.

¹Cf. JCLA, I.2 (1955), 19-22.

- Scott, Ch. M., "The Teaching of Modern Languages in Great Britain", CMLAR 11.3 (1955), 16-17.
- Seary, E. R., "The Place of Linguistics in English Studies", JCLA 1.2 (1955), 9-13.
- St. Clair-Sobell, J., "Phonology and Language Teaching", JCLA 1.2 (1955), 14-18.
- Stock, M., "Foreign Language Teaching in French Schools", CMLAR 12.1 (1955), 11-18.
- [----], "Geographical Names in the Canadian North", *Arctic* (Montreal) 8 (1955), 77.
- Université de Montréal, Section de Linguistique: *Thèses de M.A. & D.Ph. (dactylographiées)*:
- Beaudry, Mimi, *Le problème des langues en aviation internationale*. M.A. 1955. 155 p.
 - Bédard, Doreen, *Etude technique de la traduction des titres et phrases figées*. M.A. 1955. 86 p.
 - Deciry, Françoise, *Dérivation onomastique et création lexicologique*. M.A. 1955. 110 p.
 - Ferland, Thérèse, *Etude linguistique de l'emprunt*. M.A. 1955. 98 p.
 - Francoeur, Andrée, *Etude lexicologique des instruments de musique*. M.A. 1956. 168 p.
 - Francoeur, Marielle, *La modulation en traduction*. M.A. 1955. 94 p.
 - Hug, Emil, *Application of Phonetics in the Teaching of English to French Canadians*. M.A. 1956. 125p. Ill.
 - Kivisild, Livia, *Les rapports finno-russes reflétés dans le lexique*. D.Ph. 1958. 130 p. Cartes, Ill.
 - Labrèche-Michaud, Thérèse, *Les caractéristiques du vocabulaire espagnol*. M.A. 1955. 110 p.
 - Robert, Raymond, *Basque, Langues caucasiennes & leurs rapports possibles avec le substrat méditerranéen*. M.A. 1956. 102 p.
 - Saint-Pierre, Gaston, *Progress in English in the Light of Jespersen's Anthropocentric Theory*. M.A. 1955. 126 p.
 - Velyhors'kyj, I., *The Term and Name "Canada"*. Onomastica, UVAN, No. 10 (1955).
 - , *Velykij movoznavec'-myslytel'*. Do 120-richchya z dnya narodzhennya. (On Potebnia, a great linguist and philosopher), VK 19.1-25 (1955).
 - Vinay, J.-P., "Linguistics at the University of Montreal", JCLA 1.1 (1955), 20-21.
 - , "La Section de Linguistique de la Faculté des Lettres", *L'Action Universitaire* (Montréal) XXII.3 (1956), 18-21.
 - , "Rubrique de langage, I: Néologismes & création lexicologique", *JdT* (Montréal) I.2 (1955), 27-30.
 - , "Rubrique de langage, II: Vision absolue & vision comparative", *JdT* I.3 (1955), 59-63.

- , "Phonetics - A Current Bibliography", *American Speech* XXX. 3 (1955) - (En collaboration avec S. N. Treviño).
- , ed. *Stylistique & Linguistique*. Textes recueillis à l'occasion de la 3e réunion annuelle de l'Association Canadienne de Linguistique, Montréal 8-9 juin 1956. Montréal, Publ. Section de Linguistique, Série II, No. 4 (1956). 60 p. [Articles de J. Darbelnet, F. de Grand'Combe, R. Bergeron, H. Bertrand, G. Lefebvre, J.-P. Vinay].

II. CANADIAN FRENCH / FRANCO-CANADIEN.

Gaston Dulong, Roch Valin, J.-P. Vinay

[Abbreviations: VL = *Vie et Langage* (Paris, Larousse, 1952 +); RCC = *Revue Canadienne de Géographie* (Montréal); RACL = *Revue de l'Association canadienne de linguistique*; SPF = *Société du Parler français* (Université Laval); CIF = *La Classe de français* (Paris, Méridiens, 1950 +); VF = *Vie française* (Québec); RUL = *Revue de l'Université Laval*; FR = *The French Review*]

[SPF] *Etudes sur le parler français au Canada*. Québec, Presses Universitaires Laval, 1955. 221 p. (Contient les articles linguistiques suivants: C. Bruneau, "Les rapports entre les parlers provinciaux & la langue commune" 1942; M. Trudel & F. Grenier, "Répartition des groupes français au Canada depuis deux siècles", 49-60; J.-P. Vinay, "Aperçu des études de phonétique canadienne", 61-82; R. Charbonneau, "Recherche d'une norme phonétique dans le région de Montréal", 83-98; R. Beaudry, "Etat actuel des recherches sur le parler acadien", 99-110; M. Barbeau, "Vocabulaire des arts et métiers", 11-134; G. Dulong, "Projet d'un atlas linguistique du Canada français", 175-180; P. Daviault, "Anglicisme et emprunts à l'anglais", 181-192; J. E. La Follette, "Etude du français oral dans les textes folkloriques", 193-198; L. Lacourcière, "Toponymie canadienne", 199-220; J. Rousseau, "Les noms populaires des plantes au Canada français", 135-174.)

Bergeron, Richard, *Initiation à la phonétique*. Montréal, Centre de Psychologie et de Pédagogie, 1956. 142 p.

-----, *L'Accord en français moderne*. Montréal, Centre de Psychologie et de Pédagogie, 1956. 2e éd. rev. & augm.

-----, *L'Analyse vivante du français*. Montréal, Centre de Psychologie et de Pédagogie, 1955. 32 p.

Bruchési, Jean, "Présence française au Canada", CIF V. 7 (1955), 289-295.

Charbonneau, Abbé R., *La palatalisation de T/D en canadien-français*. Montréal, Publ. Section de Linguistique, Série II, No. 3 (1955). 145 p. (C. R. in RACL 2.1 (1956), 36-7).

- Daviault, Pierre, "Quelques créations canadiennes", *VL* 37 (1955), 159-162.
- , "L'anglicisme au Canada", *VL* 36 (1955), 120-123.
- Deffontaines, Pierre, "Hiver et genres de vie au Canada français", *RCG* IX. 2-3 (1955), 73-92 (Nombreux termes canadiens).
- Désy, S. E. Jean, "Archaïsmes français dans le parler canadien", *VL* 36 (1955), 98-101.
- Dulong, Gaston, "Chez les Gaspésiens", *VL* 37 (1955), 188-190.
- Forkey, Leo O., "French Canada Today", *FR.* XXIX. 4 (1956), 314-321. (Quelques remarques sur la langue, pp. 318-9).
- Garneau, René, "D'une fraternité culturelle", *VL* 37 (1955), 146-150.
- Gendron, J.-D., "Au jardin des locutions canadiennes", *VL* 37 (1955), 191-192.
- , "Quelques traits phonétiques d'une paroisse gaspésienne", *RACL* 1.1 (1955), 6-13.
- Guérin, M.-A., "Quelques aspects géographiques du terme Canadien-Français", *RCG* IX. 1 (1955), 33-42.
- Jutras, V.-P., "Proverbes canadiens", *VL* 36 (1955), 115.
- Lacourcière, L., "Les noms de lieux du Canada", *VL* 43 (1955), 473-478.
- Lalanne, P., "Langue française - langue d'Europe", *RUL* 9 (1954), 109-119.
- Le Bidois, Robert, "Petit lexique canadien français", *VL* 36 (1955), 116-119, et *VL* 37 (1955), 163-166.
- , "La langue des romans canadiens français", *VL* 26 (1955), 133-138.
- , "A la canadienne", *VL* 37 (1955), 151-152.
- Savard, Mgr. F.-A., "L'écrivain canadien et la langue française", *VL* 37 (1955), 153-158.
- [SPF] "Nouveau glossaire", *RUL* IX. 8 (1955) & X. 1 (1955) (Publication de quelques unes des milliers de fiches lexicologiques accumulées par la Société en ces dernières années).
- Tougas, Gérard, "La langue française au Canada: illusions et réalités", *FR.* XXVII. 2 (1954), 160-165.
- Trudel, Marcel, "Quelques statistiques", *VL* 37 (1955), 182-184.
- Valin, Roch, "Le français canadien", *VL* 36 (1955), 104-110.
- Vinay, J.-P., "Le français au Canada, I. Répartition des groupes francophones", *CIF* V. 7 (1955), 312-317(3 cartes).
- , "Montréal, Ville bilingue", *VL* 37 (1955), 167-169.

III. CANADIAN ENGLISH / ANGLO-CANADIEN.

Walter S. Avis.

- Avis, Walter S., "Progress Report on the Study of Canadian English," *PADS*, 23 (Apr., 1955), 57-8. [A report made to the American Dialect Society convention in New York by the Canadian Regional Secretary.]
- , "Bibliography of Writings on Canadian English," *JCLA*, 1 (Oct., 1955), 19-20.
- Devine, P. K., *Folklore of Newfoundland in Old Words, Phrases, and Expressions*, St. John's, 1937.
- England, L. E. F., *Historic Newfoundland*, St. John's, 1955, pp. 31 ff.
- Graham, Robert S., "The Anglicization of German Family Names in Western Canada," *AS*, XXX (Dec., 1955), 260-4.
- Jones, C. Meredith, "Indian, Pseudo-Indian Place Names in the Canadian West," *Onomastica*, 12 (1956), 7-19.
- Lovell, C. J., "Why and Hows of Collecting for the Dictionary of Canadian English; Part I," *JCLA*, 1 (Oct., 1955), 3-8.
- , "Whys and Hows of Collecting for the Dictionary of Canadian English: Part II," *JCLA*, 2 (Mar., 1956), 23-32.
- Scargill, M. H., "Linguistics in Canada," *Bulletin of the Humanities Association of Canada*, 17 (Jan. 1956), 2.
- , "Eighteenth Century English in Nova Scotia," *JCLA*, 2 (Mar., 1956), 3.
- Story, G. M., "A Newfoundland Dictionary: A Survey of the Problems" a paper read before the St. John's Branch of the Humanities Association of Canada, 13 April, 1956 and published by Memorial University, St. John's.
- Wilson, Rex, "The Implication of Tape Recording," *JCLA*, 2 (Mar., 1956), 17-21.

IV. AMERINDIAN LANGUAGES / LANGUES AMERINDIENNES.

Gilles R. Lefebvre, Université de Montréal.

[*Abréviations: ANTH. = Anthropologica, Centre de recherches d'anthropologie amérindienne, Université d'Ottawa; ECAS = Eastern Canadian Anthropological Series, McGill University*]

- Fried, Jacob, ed. "Bibliography and Analysis of Published Literature on Amerindian Languages in the Province of Quebec", *ECAS* 1 (1955), 1-73.
- Lefebvre, Gilles-R., *A Comparative and Annotated Glossary of the East Hudson Bay Eskimo Dialect*. Report prepared for the National Museum, Ottawa, 1955. 100p., 1 map.

- , *Towards a Unified Eskimo Orthography*. Preliminary Report, Ministry for Northern Affairs, 1955.
- , "Remarques phonologiques pour une orthographe du dialecte esquimaux de l'Est de la Baie d'Hudson", *ANTH.* 2 (1956), 39-59.
- Rousseau, J., "Le nom du caribou chez les Montagnais-Naskapi et les Esquimaux de l'Ungava", *ANTH.* I (1955), 212-214.
- Vinay, J.-P., "Classification de la famille linguistique algonquin-ritwan". *ANTH.* 1 (1955), 103-118.
- , "Les manuscrits amérindiens de Québec," *ECAS* 1 (1955), 74-84.
- , *Instruction pour une enquête ethno-linguistique*. (En collaboration avec Marcel Rioux et Jacques Rousseau). Ottawa, Centre de Recherches d'Anthropologie amérindienne, 1954. 5 fascicules, 122p.
- Peck, E. J., *Revised Eskimo Grammar*, from the Work of Rev. E. J. Peck, by the Rev. M. S. Flint. Toronto, 1954.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION

The third annual meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association was held June 8-9 at the University of Montreal. Some forty members registered. The meeting dealt with several important matters of business: the problem of financing the *Journal*, the reprinting of past issues of the *Journal*, and the question of increasing dues.

Of the several proposals advanced regarding the solution of the *Journal's* financial problems, the following has proved most feasible: the acceptance of assistance from publishers interested in promoting our aims, this assistance to be in the form of advertising. The identity of our benefactors will be evident from the ads appearing in this issue. The money received in this way will of course be augmented by funds from membership dues and subscriptions.

Photo-offsets of the first four issues of the *Journal* have been arranged for and should be available for distribution immediately. Orders for back issues (\$1.00 each) will be accepted at any time.

The suggestion that dues be raised was set aside by the meeting after considerable discussion. It was decided that the matter be placed on the agenda for June 1957 when it will be again discussed in the light of the financial position of the Association at that time.

After the election of officers, those elected being listed opposite the title page of this issue, the conference periods were given over to the reading of papers, eleven of these being presented during the three remaining sessions. The meeting next year will be held in Ottawa, probably early in June.

Members will be interested to learn that the membership campaign undertaken this summer has been modestly successful. It is hoped that over two hundred names will be on our list by the end of the year. Needless to say, we solicit the help of all current members in this campaign.

We are delighted to report that Memorial University of Newfoundland has generously undertaken to award the Association the sum of \$100.00 each year for five years. Moreover,

a number of private members have made contributions of varying amounts, thus expressing their whole-hearted interest in our success.

Membership renewals have been coming in with encouraging regularity, although a number of members are still in arrears. It might be pointed out here that the expense of handling dues is inordinately high. You can help us to control our expenses by taking the trouble to add 15 cents to your remittance when paying by cheque. Furthermore, cheques in future will be regarded as sufficient receipt for payment, unless a specific request for an official receipt accompanies the payment. We look forward to your co-operation in these details of administration.

Walter S. Avis
Secretary-Treasurer

6
1

TO SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS . . .

Seldom does a textbook break new ground and provide a completely new approach to a standard subject. PATTERNS OF ENGLISH does exactly that.

Here is a trail-blazing textbook that will give students in the upper years of high school fresh insights into their language and how it works.

The new methods used apply the more recent findings of linguistics studies to the practical problems of teaching students to understand their language better and to use it more effectively.

In PATTERNS OF ENGLISH, Paul Roberts

- Develops the major concept that structure determines meaning . . .
 - Demonstrates that the English language is made up of a few basic sentence patterns that can be combined and modified in a great variety of ways . . .
 - Shows relation of punctuation and intonation to written and oral patterns . . .
 - Provides simple step-by-step explanations, with illustrations, to develop an understanding of each new pattern.

Familiar grammatical terms are used for the most part—new terms are introduced or old terms re-defined only to clear up confusion.

PATTERNS OF ENGLISH will be of interest to all high school English teachers who have found that conventional textbooks do not give a full picture of how the English language really works --- and of special interest to those who feel that merely the re-teaching "traditional grammar" has reached the point of no return.

List Price \$3.25

Huppé and Kaminsky **LOGIC AND LANGUAGE**

by Bernard F. Huppé, Professor of English, and
Jack Kaminsky, Assistant Professor of Philosophy,
both at Harpur College, State University of New York.
1956. 216 pp. \$1.75.

Combining a treatment of logic as it is related to effective expression, and of language as it is related to thinking, this book is aimed directly at writing and at Freshman English. Its treatment of language is descriptive rather than prescriptive, and it considers language both as an aid and as an obstacle to thought. The discussion of logic, both inductive and deductive, is sufficiently detailed to be thoroughly clear, but avoids technical terminology except where necessary. Varied and interesting exercise material provides a basis for classroom work and specific illustration of the principles discussed. Its low price and brevity make this an ideal supplementary text for teachers who wish to deal with these problems more fully than is customary in general texts.

Lloyd and Warfel **AMERICAN ENGLISH IN ITS CULTURAL SETTING**

by Donald J. Lloyd, Associate Professor of English,
Wayne University, and Harry R. Warfel, Professor of
English, University of Florida. 1956. 640 pp. \$4.50

This book combines a complete display of the patterns of modern American English with a rhetoric which practices what it preaches. The author treats the language the way a chemistry text treats chemistry, simply laying it out as it exists without stopping by the way to refute alchemy. This display is based on the findings of modern descriptive linguistics, and is detailed enough for any student's needs. Traditional terminology is utilized wherever possible, and new terms are clearly explained. Pedagogically, the book is rooted in the experience of two able and experienced teachers, and it has been carefully tried out in the classroom. The whole emphasis is humanistic, on language as a human and social activity. This is a book which makes our language come alive to the student, which helps him move from the point where he is to a command of the arts of reading and writing, to the development of a personal style.

Bowen **PRACTICAL PROSE STUDIES: A Critical Anthology
of Contemporary American Prose Readings for the
College Freshman**

by Robert O. Bowen, The Writers Workshop, Uni-
versity of Iowa, 1956. 355 pp. \$3.75

These essays, ordered in an arrangement of increasing complexity, are grouped in categories which reflect various points of view the writer takes toward his material. The language problems the book raises are those that appear constantly to all writers, tyros or professionals, hacks or artists; and the suggestions about those problems which the text offers are the practical product of the editor's years as a teacher of writing on all levels and as a professional writer in a wide variety of fields. Focused entirely on writing, it avoids a major dilemma in the teaching of composition - trying to teach workday prose to average students with the literature of another age as a model - and it makes a much-needed contribution by offering examples of badness which can be demonstrated clearly to freshmen.

McCLELLAND & STEWART LIMITED

Educational Department

25 Hollinger Road Toronto 16, Canada

605

and
lit-
ive
as
uc-
cal
na-
the
ple-
ore

NG

can
eats
g it
dis-
de-
ized
lly,
ers,
asis
is a
elps
ead-

are
akes
those
s or
fers
g on
Fo-
g of
the
eed
ated